

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

44-60-3885

Approved For Release 2002/07/10 : CIA-RDP78-05551A000200050012-7

Office Memorandum • UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

TO : Comptroller

DATE: 7 March 1960

FROM : Chief, Financial Analysis Staff

SUBJECT: Inspector General's Survey of the CIA Career Service

1. This thought provoking paper is an able and thorough presentation of the background, history and status of Career Service in the Agency. In general, we agree with this survey which so closely parallels the Comptroller's comment last year in response to a request of the Inspector General.

25X1A

2. One can hardly disagree with the statement that Career Service was set up to provide a "group of carefully selected and trained individuals who accept an obligation to devote themselves to the needs of the Agency and who intend to make a career with the Agency" [redacted] or that "there are far too many employees of all kinds and at all levels who are indisposed to place the Agency's interest above their own".

3. Neither can we find any serious objection with the blunt but valid and to the point evaluation of the present system, especially Section G, paragraphs 1, 2, 3 and 5. However, the idea expressed in Section G, paragraph 4, while in itself inoffensive, is of concern especially in view of ideas expressed in Section I, paragraph 1(b), "There is a distinction to be drawn between Intelligence careerists and non-careerist Agency employees. The latter will include many specialists at all levels whose careers lie in other fields but whose services are required by the Agency in the performance of its mission."

4. There is still a great need for a comprehensive, just and equitable career development program. We have yet to develop an "esprit de corps" but we cannot agree that the offering of greater inducements (Section H, paragraph 8) to young people and their development will of itself accomplish this result. The offering of more advantages will only accomplish the hoped for results when there exists a desire on the part of the individual to become a member of the organization. In short, the organization itself must create a favorable climate before the individual on his part can wholeheartedly and selflessly dedicate himself to the welfare of the organization. The FBI is a case in point. The Bureau has a hold on its personnel which transcends the material advantages offered. In fact, to many, the disadvantages far outweigh the advantages, yet a large majority of the agents enthusiastically carry on. That is the kind of spirit we need here but the mere offering of inducements will not accomplish the results desired.

5. In general, one must agree with the objective sought in the latter part of this survey - The development of an adequate and effective career service. On the other hand, we cannot subscribe to the insistence that those engaged in the collection and dissemination of intelligence are to be considered as the elite - all others being relegated to a sort of second class citizenship. Neither can we accept the implication in Section J, paragraph 2 (page 23), that all super grades and all senior management positions should be reserved eventually for the Intelligence careerist. How can it be said that only "Intelligence careerists" are subject to hazardous duty, have to endure hardship posts and, therefore, are entitled to more liberal benefits? Are not Support personnel overseas also subjected to those disadvantages? Should they be denied these benefits?

6. We agree that Agency employees should be evaluated. We have almost limitless potential in the employees presently on board. Unless steps are taken to evaluate employees in an equitable manner, the Agency has neither a career service nor can it lay claim to having taken full recognition of its human resources.

7. The establishment of a Career Development Board is a step in the right direction. One board superceeding the conglomeration of overlapping committees, boards, councils and panels, if granted the backing and given the authority, could develop and administer an equitable career program.

8. We cannot quarrel with the comment (Section M, paragraph 12) that the existing career services are "too many and too limited in scope to permit the proper functioning of a career program. They should be substantially reduced in number and be established on occupational lines rather than organizational."

9. The setting up of an Administrative Career Service to include all senior administrators and Support officers is reasonable but who is to be included - only those in the present Administrative Service? Who are to be considered Support officers? Do they consider Logistics officers only as Support officers or are Comptroller personnel so considered? A single clerical service covering typists and clerks, messengers, etc. would be an improvement over the present system but it will not decrease the turnover rate to any appreciable extent. Grouping technicians such as business machine operators, radio, communication equipment operators, visual aids, photographers, etc. into a single service would be desirable.

10. We do question the classification of accountants along with scientists and economists, educators, engineers, etc. as mere specialists whose careers were developed before they joined the Agency, who wish to remain only in the limited capacity of their specialty, and perhaps ultimately to pursue their careers further in private life or elsewhere. We object to being considered employees whose "career development potential is minimal if it exists at all". We consider

it a low blow to be regarded as "non-careerists in Intelligence and should not be intermingled with true careerists". We cannot accept a classification that accountants are not capable of being considered for a career in Intelligence when a lawyer, at least by inference, is considered eligible. At least he is not classified as a specialist.

11. Many of us in the Comptroller's shop turned our back on promising careers outside the Agency. We entered, some of us at least, at the request of the Agency because we had experience needed by the Agency. We accepted the disadvantages and occupational hazards because we felt we could assist in building up an effective Intelligence Organization. The advantages of a career service status was also dangled before our eyes. We were offered career status and accepted willingly the possibility of assignment at the will of the Agency without any compensating benefits. Are we now to infer that it was all a mistake?

12. We come, therefore, to the crux of the matter. Accountants or economists along with others are not considered eligible for the hard core of professional intelligence officers, even though the collection, analyzation and evaluation of financial and economic data in many instances may provide the key to vital intelligence material. An FI or PP case officer, on the other hand, even though he is unfamiliar with financial and economic data, is considered eligible because he collects intelligence data. He may not know what he is getting, but because he collects data he is eligible for the hard core career service.

13. This may not be the intent yet this can be deduced from the presentation as made. If this deduction be valid then the proposal has two fundamental flaws. It gives greater weight to location and present assignment than to background, knowledge, ability and varied experience, and it assumes that the duties of the specialists in the Agency are no different in any significant respect from those found in non-intelligence agencies of the government when such is not the case.

25X1A9A